

Illinois U Library

TOWN MEETING



July 24, 1955
Vol. 21, No. 13
880th Broadcast

"BOX-SCORE ON THE 84th CONGRESS"

Speakers:

SEN. CARL T. CURTIS
SEN. ROBERT S. KERR
REP. EUGENE McCARTHY
REP. CHET HOLIFIELD
REP. KENNETH KEATING
REP. GEORGE MEADER

Moderator:

GUNNAR BACK



Broadcast from
Senate Radio Gallery
Washington, D. C.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"BOX-SCORE ON THE 84th CONGRESS"

MR. BACK: This session of the 84th Congress is only a few weeks away from adjournment, so close to quitting time that its over-all accomplishments and shortcomings are being put side by side, as TOWN MEETING is undertaking to do tonight. The final box-score is being made up and both parties are beginning to sound their claims to the accomplishments. The political analysts are having quite a time trying to explain this session. It hasn't run the way of the forecasts. When the session started in January, the Democrats were in control of Congress again after the Eisenhower avalanche in 1952. We were going to see things hum, we understood, back in January as the Democrats talked about undoing some of the things the previous Republican Congress had done and, at the same time, writing a new Democratic record to help get Ike out of the White House next year. That's the way we Washington reporters saw the wind blowing last January.

President Eisenhower himself had warned that if the Democrats got control of Congress this year, there would be a cold war between the White House and the Capitol -- and nothing might be settled. Instead, as you well know, in Congress we have seen something like the traditional picture of two prize-fighters waltzing together in the ring, if I may use a rather broad figure of speech to which our panel tonight may instantly object. But these questions can be asked: What Happened? And was friendship in the ring better for the country than a knockdown fight? And who won?

Tonight, six members of Congress are at TOWN MEETING'S microphones in the radio gallery of the Senate, here in the Capitol in Washington. Two Senators are here and four members of the House -- three are Republicans -- three are Democrats, so we'll get at least two explanations of what happened in the 84th Congress -- the Republican explanation and the Democratic explanation, as TOWN MEETING takes this hour to discuss the subject: "Box-Score on the 84th Congress."

We're going to turn first to Senator Robert S. Kerr, Democrat of Oklahoma -- once a governor of his state -- once a candidate for the presidential nomination of his party, and now serving his second term as a member of the Senate. We're glad to have you back again on TOWN MEETING, Senator Kerr of Oklahoma.

SEN. KERR: The 84th Congress to date has the best box-score of any Congress in recent history when the executive and legislative were controlled by different political parties. The President's foreign policy has been saved and often made by Democrats in Congress. There would not even have been a Big Four Summit Meeting at Geneva but for the outspoken insistence of Senator Walter George, Democratic Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. At that meeting the President could not have been strong enough but for the united Congressional backing initiated by Democratic leadership.

In complete contrast to the opposition of the Republican leadership in the 80th Do-Nothing Congress, seeking merely to oppose the Democratic President, the Democrats in this Congress have supported a Republican President, except when his proposals were not for the common good. For example, we saved the country from a terrible Eisenhower blunder in the Dixon-Yates deal, which would have squandered public money for private power interests and again we saved the country from the terribly dangerous policy of a cut-rate Air Force, which was penny-pinching national defense. In spite of Presidential opposition, we are starting more than 100 water conservation projects to create new wealth in most of the states. According to the non-partisan Congressional Quarterly, Democrats supplied the necessary votes 29 times on the 33 legislative victories recently claimed by President Eisenhower. We have taken the best part of the President's program and improved it with constructive amendments.

As was so eloquently stated recently by Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon Johnson of Texas, our record completely disproves the President's 1954 campaign warning that

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

Democrats would "bottle up" programs for partisan advantage. We have demonstrated responsibility in leadership and operation. Actually, this Congress has far outscored the preceding Republican 83rd Congress in constructive legislation. And, when the final score is tallied, the President will be citing the record of this Congress with far more pride than he has thus far seen fit to do for the preceding Republican 83rd Congress.

MR. BACK: Thank you very much, Senator Kerr of Oklahoma. You've succeeded in raising a few eyebrows in the panel. We're going to turn now to one of these -- a freshman Senator, but a veteran of Congress, Senator Carl Curtis, Republican of Nebraska. Senator Curtis has been in Congress since 1939 -- he lists his chief interests as taxation, social security, tariffs, trade agreements and staying within the national debt. We're glad to have your estimate of the box-score of the 84th Congress and we're glad to have you back on TOWN MEETING again, Senator Curtis of Nebraska.

SEN. CURTIS: Thank you, Gunnar Back. I'm glad to be back. I can't help but wonder what Congress Senator Kerr has been talking about. We might ask what the box-score is on the 84th Congress from a standpoint of rendering service to the people back home. The Democratic Party controls the committees and all the machinery of both Houses. They determine what legislation shall be advanced for passage.

The box-score is low. It is true the necessary appropriation bills to carry on the government have proceeded about in the usual manner. However, in many of those bills a disregard for the taxpayers and a failure to drive hard for a balanced budget has been evident. At the same time, personal squabbles have made some of the appropriation procedures something to be desired. On one bill the House was denied the right to vote on over a billion dollars of important national defense installations because of Committee conflicts.

The Democratic program seemed to be anything that might gain political advantage in the election of 1956. They opened the Congress with a campaign involving the squirrels on the White House lawn. I need not remind this audience that that program fell flat. The squirrels were too smart.

Another program undertaken by the Democrats in Congress was the ridicule heaped upon President Dwight D. Eisenhower in regard to his church attendance. Once more the American people showed their resentment and that part of their program was dropped. While great talent and time was spent in such efforts for political gain, it was that much talent and time not directed toward solving the basic problems of the country.

The 84th Congress came in with a big hue and cry by the Democrats that they were going to investigate security firings by the Republican Administration. To listen one might think that every good, loyal public servant had his job in jeopardy because the Republican Administration had fired him on false charges that he was a security risk. None of these investigations hit pay dirt. When the issue was faced squarely, it became evident that the Democrats were assuming the role of defending security risks. Some of these people fired may have been out-and-out Communists, others had some shortcoming in their makeup that made them unfit to serve the government in these critical times. The public has approved the firings. The Democratic chieftains, as defense counsel for the security risks, found that they had a poor case. We no longer hear anything about the investigation of the firing of security risks.

Even though the Democrats are quite expert in appropriating huge sums of money, because they have had a lot of experience in it, their tax program is something else. The 84th Congress was started out with a Democratic promise to the American people that they would reduce taxes. Their efforts were branded in some quarters as irresponsible. I do not make that charge. I say let the facts speak for themselves. Had their bill passed, 5 million people would have been taken off the income tax roles. We would have lost over \$2.1 billion in revenue in a full year. Rather than call names, let the Democrats judge their own tax program. They had a majority in both Houses of Congress, they controlled both tax writing committees. Yet, their bill did not pass. They turned it down themselves. Their attempt to lessen the public revenue failed. They also failed in their political objective of embarrassing President Eisenhower by forcing him to veto a tax reduction bill which the country cannot afford at this time.

About the only conclusion I can draw is that the box-score is rather low.

MR. BACK: Thank you, Senator Curtis. Since the Senate is the one chamber in which unlimited talk is permitted, we've allowed the two Senators on TOWN MEETING tonight to set the scene. In just a moment we're going to hear some challenges, I am sure, of these two sets of claims from the 4 members of the House who are in our panel tonight. Let me go back now and return to Senator Kerr for any comment which he wishes to make.

SEN. KERR: Well, the Senator from Nebraska has talked about nearly everything except the subject for the debate. I'm glad he referred to the Democratic program of taxation which was one effort in which we came very close to success but lost by reason of united opposition of the Republicans. We sought to recover \$1.5 billion per year from the special interest in the special privilege tax relief that the Republicans gave to those groups last year, and we sought to provide \$1 billion a year in tax relief to the lower income groups in our country -- and in that effort wherein we sought to represent all of the taxpayers, and especially the low income groups, we were defeated. But whether it has been for additional anti-trust penalties, debt limit increases, doctors' draft, doctor extension, foreign aid authorization, military construction, tax windfall repeal or reciprocal trade, or any other legislative proposal in this Congress for the common welfare the Democratic leadership and membership have gone forward and served the people successfully and well.

SEN. CURTIS: Senator Kerr, this charge that the Republicans granted special tax benefits to the special interest is just without foundation. You people have the votes, if that were true you would repeal those particular taxes. If it were true you would have the help of many Republicans in both the House and Senate. They face the same constituency at the polls as you do. There are more people of middle-class who do not belong to any special interest to control the election in every district and every state. If you had a case that could prove that, you would have passed your bill this year. Now may I also point out an error in your statement about the Dixon-Yates program. First, let me say in connection with the TVA, the Dixon-Yates contract had nothing to do with the development of natural resources. It was a question -- when there is a power need in a certain area, shall it be supplied out of the Federal Treasury and tax all the people, or shall private enterprise or local interests do it. A course was followed that resulted in the local interests at Memphis supplying the need. It's their public power, they can control it. It's not nationalized power run by politicians in Washington and the Federal Treasury was saved about \$105 million, all of which was opposed by the Democratic Congress which has opposed almost every good thing this administration has offered and spent their time talking about squirrels and church attendance and making charges concerning the tax program that, if were true, you could get out the votes and repeal them.

MR. BACK: Senator Kerr, may I ask you to reply now and I must call on the 4 Congressmen. They can't stand this much longer.

SEN. KERR: I want you to go ahead because the Senator has offered nothing new. I am delighted that he is defending tax relief for the few and opposing tax relief for the many and defending special privilege contracts like Dixon-Yates where a \$125 million bill was given to one power group without competitive bidding and without regard to the public itself. I am delighted that he has taken the position of defending those things. I think it speaks for itself and I suggest that you bring our great colleagues from the House of Representatives into this because I know they'll make a great contribution.

MR. BACK: Thank you, Senator Kerr. Let me introduce collectively now the other members of our panel. They are Representative Kenneth B. Keating, the New York Republican a lawyer, World War II general, member of Congress for a 4th term; Representative Eugene McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota, a college professor turned member of Congress, here also for his 4th term; Representative George Meader, Republican of Michigan, who is in his 3rd term, although he served well in Washington for 7 years before that as a counsel in some of the chief Senate investigating positions and finally, we're to hear from Representative Chet Holifield, a Democrat of California, who certainly is interested in Dixon-Yates. He is a member of the joint atomic energy committee of the Congress, and a veteran of Congress since way back in 1942. Everyone of the 4 Congressmen I have just named have been on TOWN MEETING before in other memorable debates and I'm glad to see you all back again. Congressman Holifield.

REP. HOLIFIELD: I'm happy you called upon me as the first of the members of Congress because I couldn't hardly keep still when Senators Kerr and Curtis were talking about the Dixon-Yates contract. As you probably know, I brought that matter out in the hearings before the atomic energy committee last year when we were discussing the revision of the Atomic Energy Act, and on June 7 last year, I placed in the record an 18 point analysis showing where the Dixon-Yates contract was a disadvantage to the government of the United States. By the sworn testimony of representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and approved by the budget, we had figures given to us to show that it would cost the people of the United States \$92 million more -- a minimum of \$92 million more -- than if the City of Memphis had bought their electric energy from the TVA and, of course, this \$92 million would go right into the pockets of a chosen instrument, the partnership of Dixon and Yates who, for some unknown reason, had the mantle of benevolence placed around their shoulders and were given the non-competitive position of putting this job through. Now, of course, after about six months of the Democratic exposure of this, why the Republican Administration found an out and that out, of course, was available to them all along if they had wanted to take it, because the City of Memphis, way back in January of this year, told the budget bureau and the President and made a public announcement from official bodies, that they would not take one kilowatt of this electric energy from across the river in the swamps of Arkansas in the Dixon-Yates plan, but that they would either build their own plant or obtain electricity from another source and so they had this out ready for them all along but the heat wasn't on quite hot enough and when the heat did get hot enough, why they availed themselves of this out.

REP. KEATING: I am delighted that Congressman Holifield sought to talk about Dixon-Yates. I can understand why he wasn't willing to talk about the accomplishments, or the lack of accomplishments, of the 84th broken promise Congress run by the Democrats. This Dixon-Yates, of course, had nothing to do with the accomplishments or lack of accomplishments of this Democratic Congress. However, I think we should deal with that question because there has been a studied effort by the Democrats to use this phrase -- Dixon-Yates -- as if it was something like Communist, as if it were a word of opprobrium and we might as well put it to rest right here and now. President Eisenhower, way back in the beginning, tried to get the City of Memphis to build its own power plant. He believes in this local control of their power facilities, whether it be by private interests or by municipalities and that they should be in every way encouraged to do the job for themselves, but they refused to do it. Now, after all of this controversy, along came the City of Memphis and changed its mind and said we will build our plant. Consequently, of course, the President achieved exactly what he was trying to accomplish in the beginning. It is significant that the same interests in general, Dixon and Yates, were involved in a contract in the Truman Administration amounting to something like $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the value of this one, where they made a private contract not nearly as good from the point of view of the government as this one, to build a plant in Paducah, Kentucky, which happens to be the home town of the then Vice President of the United States, now Senator Barkley. You never heard any screams about that being a great give-away or a great loss to the government when that was done, involving $2\frac{1}{2}$ times what this one involves. But now, in seeing that there might be some political advantage in screaming these words "Dixon-Yates" and that the Republicans were giving away the country, they have sought to talk about this and make it a campaign issue. Now when we get back to the subject under discussion, namely the lack of accomplishment of this 84th Congress, I'd like to be heard again on that.

REP. HOLIFIELD: My friend, Mr. Keating, referred to the contracts of the previous administration, but those contracts were for the defense of our nation. They were to make atomic bombs and the Dixon-Yates contract was to light the houses and churches and factories of Memphis and it's an altogether different proposition. We make certain concessions in defense contracts for the welfare of our nation but to put it into the coffers of a private corporation is another problem.

SEN. CURTIS: Now I've heard everything. The fact that these contracts shouldn't be investigated because they relate to national defense!

REP. HOLIFIELD: I didn't say that -- I didn't say they shouldn't be investigated.

SEN. CURTIS: Well, I have sent several letters to the committee asking that they investigate the Paducah contract and the Portsmouth contract, which was entered into by the Atomic Energy Commission under the Truman Administration. Your committee failed and refuses to do it because you know that those contracts are not near as fair to the American tax-payer as the one of Dixon-Yates. I come back to the premise that you bring out and talk about those things which you think will make political mention, rather than facing the facts.

MR. BACK: I wonder if we could get to exactly what happened in this session on taxation. Could you turn to that, Congressman McCarthy?

REP. MCCARTHY: The excise tax was continued and the 52% tax on corporate profits was continued. The principal controversy in the House was over a proposal on the part of the Democrats to provide a \$20 tax credit for every tax-payer and in the Senate, as I recall, coupled with that an attempt to repeal the dividend exemptions. I would make the observation that in the course of the last three years, particularly in the last year on tax matters, through presentations by the Secretary of the Treasury, I think we can see the development of a new concept of taxation -- a concept which would exempt certain types of income from the tax rates that are imposed on income. Dividends, for example, have already been given special treatment. Certain proposals and provisions in the tax law gives special treatment to interest income. You have a whole movement to extend the coverage of capital gains to include more and more income that is currently taxed as regular income, and also a tendency to exempt from income tax income which is being reinvested so that what you are developing is a tax system in which the tax levy actually falls upon earned income which is likely to be spent in the current year or very close to that. In effect, what you have is a modified sales tax or an exchange tax so that really, in effect, the income earner who is forced to spend his income in the same year or very close to the same year, is coming to carry more and more of the burden of taxation in this country. I think it is a significant development indicating really a complete change away from the principle upon which we have been operating of having the graduated income tax apply to income which is earned in the year in which it is earned.

REP. MEADER: I was about to observe that the statements of my Democratic colleagues on this program were typical of the 84th Congress -- a lot of talk about something they didn't do and didn't have anything to do with, to cover up their failures to do something in the public interest. Here we were talking about a matter of private power versus public power in which the only legislative action the House has taken, that I know about, was to refuse to transfer some \$6 million for transmission lines to the erection of the Fulton Steam Plant and the Tennessee Valley Authority. I would like to say that on most of the matters of legislation, there has been no clear party cleavage. On appropriation matters there has been not much of an effort on the part of this Congress to reduce budget estimates made by the administration and, by and large, on other matters of major policy there have not been clear party cleavages. But there have been one or two indications of a differing philosophy and I would say that the record has pretty clearly shown in instances such as have been discussed here and otherwise, that the Democrats are not really staunch supporters of the free enterprise system and have no fear of having the government grow bigger and bigger, and engage in business after business, tending towards Socialism. Their stand on public power is one example of that. Another example is the rider that was stuck on the Military Appropriation Bill which prohibited the government from getting out of industrial and commercial enterprises. You may remember that the President said he regarded that as unconstitutional legislation. But we had a fight on the floor of the House and Carl Vincent, a good Democrat from Georgia, offered an amendment to remove the Sikes provision in the Defense Appropriation Bill. At first it carried in the committee as a whole and then the leadership got to work and on the roll call, they reversed that decision and maintained this position of keeping the defense establishment in industrial and commercial activities which, in my judgment, are no proper activity of the government.

MR. BACK: Before we go into that, we ought to be clear as to exactly what happened. As I understand it, the Defense Department can go out of those functions which

it has performed and give functions to private business, but it has to come back to Congress for an okay. Is that right?

REP. MEADER: It has to come to the committees of the Congress and, I think, wait 90 days

SEN. KERR: In those cases where the Defense Department has been saving money by doing certain things itself, before it can change it must come back and clear its proposed change with the committees of the House or the Senate on armed services and appropriations.

REP. McCARTHY: I would say that the action that we took did not prohibit the government from getting out of business but provided for an orderly procedure. What we proposed to do was comparable with what we did with regard to the rubber plants which were sold.

REP. HOLIFIELD: I want to say that one of the most amazing things about that was the President's statement where he said that he thought that this particular provision was unconstitutional and he was going to set it aside until a court of competent jurisdiction ordered him to obey it. Now this is one of the most amazing statements that I think any President has ever made. In other words, he doesn't like the law, therefore, he is not going to obey it until the court makes him. It has always been my impression that when a law is passed that you don't like, you obey it until a court tells you not to obey it and not set it aside until the court makes you obey it.

REP. KEATING: That's interesting to me to hear a Democrat say when Mr. Truman, when he was President, opposed so many appropriations that the Congress made and said I won't use this money unless your appropriate it the way I want it. Obviously the provision that was written into this law was unconstitutional. There can't be, to my mind, any question in the mind of a good lawyer on that subject. In the law we endeavored to tie a string on the actions of the executive. Now the separation of powers doctrine provides that the legislative shall have the function of making the laws and the executive of executing them. After we've made a law and put in the hands of the executive to execute, we can't tie a string on that and provide that we are going to be able to veto the action of the President.

REP. HOLIFIELD: We put strings on every law that goes to the executive branch. We put the strings on in advance and they have to spend the money according to the strings which Congress puts on it.

REP. KEATING: But we don't make them come back to us and get approval on every move they make.

SEN. CURTIS: I have a comment about this tax situation. I think a pattern is developing here where the public will not take seriously the claims of the Democratic Congress. A few years ago we passed the Taft-Hartley Law. It was a good law -- the workers approved it, the public approved it -- Democratic Congresses said we'll repeal it. They've had several Congresses where they had all the votes without a single Republican vote and they disregard that promise. In connection with this program, we gave the country one of the finest tax revision bills in the history of the country. One leading magazine said it was the greatest piece of legislative work in this generation. It brought benefits to farmers, to workers, to working wives, to a great many other people. The Democrats come along and say: well, here's some secret parts of it that give something to the special privilege and we're going to repeal it. They have the votes to repeal that law or any part thereof without a single Republican vote, and they don't do it. They make idle charges to the public -- they do not substantiate them and they do not carry them out. Another place the pattern takes shape -- they were going to investigate the firings of security risks. Well, they don't do it. They know those people ought to be fired. And so it fell flat. They do not carry out their promises.

SEN. KERR: I want to talk about the taxes just a minute. We talked about that great bill that the Republicans passed here in the previous Congress in which about 80% of the benefits of the bill went to less than 5% of the people.

SEN. CURTIS: Why don't you repeal it?

SEN. KERR: Well, we did repeal the blooper. That was another example of Presidential retreat. He and Humphrey said that was a fine thing and was going to keep it

and it would be about \$40 million and when the Democrats showed up it was going to cost the Treasury \$1 billion to \$5 billion a year in special privileges -- why your Secretary of the Treasury came up there and said maybe he had made a mistake.

SEN. CURTIS: We corrected one matter in a bill of over 1,000 pages, and we did it with Republican votes and with a Republican Treasurer.

MR. BACK: Gentlemen, we've pretty well discussed taxes -- we know that the excise taxes are continued -- the excess profits tax is continued -- the \$20 reduction in personal income didn't get through. On the Dixon-Yates matter, we now know that the Dixon-Yates contract is cancelled. Isn't that right?

REP. MCCARTHY: One more point on taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury testified the other day that the amortization provision which was written in and continued in the code of last year -- really a wartime provision -- is costing us about \$1 billion a year in loss of revenue and he's asking us to change that. He also said that whereas during World War II, under emergency conditions, certificates in the amount of about \$7 billion dollars were granted by the Democratic Administration, that since that time certificates in the amount of \$31 billion have been granted, as a result of which, he says, we're losing about \$1 billion a year in revenue and he's asking us to do something about it.

REP. MEADER: May I interject. I sat in the committee that heard Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey yesterday. In fact, I sat right next to the Secretary and the figure was not \$1 billion, it was \$882 million for this year, and he conceded that that would be made up by the taxes that would be paid on property that had already been amortized in subsequent years and it's not fair to say that that is an exact tax loss. I mean I just don't like to have this \$1 billion figure thrown around because it is inaccurate and misleading.

REP. MCCARTHY: Well -- \$882 million.

REP. MEADER: But that is not a tax loss.

REP. MCCARTHY: He thinks it is.

REP. MEADER: Well, now, wait a minute. It is for this year but it is compensated for by tax gains in subsequent years and the property has already been written off. May I say just one more thing because I've been wanting to say this for quite awhile. Senatore Kerr said that this Congress had done more than any Congress in recent history, where the Executive and the Congress were of different party. I was not a member of the 80th Congress so perhaps I may be permitted to say something without boasting, but the 80th Congress, which was a Republican Congress under a Democratic President, President Truman, balanced the budget and reduced taxes and the 83rd Congress gave a \$7.5 billion reduction in taxes last year.

SEN. KERR: The 83rd Congress did no such thing, and any man who says it demonstrates that he knows absolutely nothing about it. The reduction in taxes that went into effect last year were by reason of the Democratic bill passed before the 83rd Congress.....

REP. KEATING: Yes, and there never in the world would have been a law in the same Democratic situation year after year, as it was under the Democrats, that they would have extended that law had not the Republicans come in, and anybody that says anything to the contrary shows that he doesn't know what he's talking about.

SEN. CURTIS: In one breath my good friend, Senator Kerr, condemns the tax reduction -- says it's awful -- and now he takes credit for it.

SEN. KERR: I'm talking about different tax reductions.

SEN. CURTIS: Oh no, we're talking about the whole tax picture. In reference to this rapid amortization provision, I do not agree with all the criticism heaped upon it, but granting for a moment that that criticism is true, a Democratic Congress passed the bill -- a Republican Administration now is asking for it to be repealed.

SEN. KERR: That is not correct.

SEN. CURTIS: The amortization was passed in connection with the Korean War.

SEN. KERR: The defense amortization was. The rapid acceleration or depreciation provision that is costing us more than \$1 billion a year was in your bill that you passed here last.....

REP. MCCARTHY: There are two questions Senator Curtis raised that I think we should at least reply to. One was the Democrats' use of the religious life of the President and the other was the so-called security question. I think we had one Senator who made a statement on the religious life of the President but, actually, the Democrats have some cause to raise that question. You know, the then Speaker of the House, Joe Martin, in April before the last election, made a speech up in New Jersey in which he said that the future of religion hung in the balance in that election and indicated if the Republicans didn't win, that we would probably not have the opportunity to worship as we had in this country. Just a few weeks ago, the Secretary of Agriculture was out in the west and he stopped at one town and said the reason agriculture was suffering was because we had a Democratic Congress and then, at the next stop, he asked the people to pray for rain. Now, I think he ought to explain whether the Democrats were responsible for the lack of rain or whether the Democrats could give rain.

SEN. CURTIS: Do you disagree with the Secretary?

REP. MCCARTHY: I do disagree with him, unless he wants to give us credit for divine powers.

MR. BACK: Let's go to the question of these investigations. Senator Curtis has raised that point. Why haven't we investigated security?

REP. MCCARTHY: The Senate and the House have both approved a commission to study the whole program. I don't think we need any more investigation. It has been exposed to the public as to the nature of these security firings. Take the Ladejinsky case, for example. You don't need an investigation of that. It's open to the public. A recent newspaper report here in Washington showed that, I think, of every case that has been taken to court, that the Administration had lost its case. You don't need any more investigation. What you need is a non-partisan commission such as has been set up to make a study, not necessarily a study, but to get out a report which can be separated from charges of partisanship and give the picture to the people.

REP. KEATING: The point that Senator Curtis made, as I understand it, is the Democrats issued all these press releases, beat the bushes and yelled all over the country about the investigations they were going to make of the security risk firings. Then, when they made a little quiet investigation, they found that the Democrats that had been hired on the payroll were deserving of being fired and they abandoned all this investigation. They have now, in both Houses, passed this resolution to appoint this commission, which is undoubtedly a good thing, to survey this whole question, but a legislative investigation of the firing of security risks has been completely abandoned and it is just exactly that sort of thing that caused me to call this the broken promise Congress, because they have yelled about all these things but they have done nothing about them when they got into power.

REP. HOLIFIELD: Mr. Back, I don't care to carry that conversation any further because I think the Congress has acted upon it and are doing something about it and we've proved that the numbers game was no good. But I would like to refer to the subject of our panel today and that is the major legislative actions and I have a compilation here that shows that the Congress has passed 58 major legislative bills, up until the 5th of July, in this particular session and some of those bills, I want to emphasize, have been passed over the President's veto, such as the Postal Pay Bill and the Federal Employees Pay Bill which brought to about 2 million people an approximate 8% increase and we had to pass it over the President's veto twice in order to get that bill. But he didn't veto the Military Pay Bill which gave 12%.

REP. MEADER: We didn't override the President's veto on the President's Postal Pay Bill. They were trying to play politics with it and they finally brought it up on suspension. When they got through arguing back and forth, the bill was passed.

REP. HOLIFIELD: Nevertheless, the President vetoed it twice and then we passed the bill which gave to the people the raises they were entitled to.

MR. BACK: I wonder if we might talk a minute about the Formosa policy. Is there any argument about that? Is that one of the achievements of this session?

SEN. KERR: The resolution was passed practically unanimously in the Senate under the strong leadership of Senator Walter George, Democrat of Georgia.

MR. BACK: And the German treaties were accepted in this session. That's an achievement, is it not?

SEN. KERR: Unitedly supported by both parties.

SEN. CURTIS: Well, wouldn't you say that both of those were Republican achievements? They were Eisenhower proposals. After all, how did China land in the hands of the Reds -- and in reference to the German treaty, how in the world did you have a divided Germany? Not through Republican Administrations and here are some steps taken to correct them.

MR. BACK: Let's go to reciprocal trade.

REP. MCCARTHY: I would like to make one point regarding the China situation and particularly with regard to the developments in Europe -- that these things were all in the way of coming about. Really, the stability in Europe cannot be explained any way, excepting to a large measure in consequence of the Marshall Plan and the policy which was initiated and carried practically to completion in Europe after World War II with both Republican and Democratic support in the Congress. I don't think we can say that because the decision has come at this particular point that all the credit can go to President Eisenhower. If we are going to go back to the question of why Germany was divided, then I think we should have to charge the President with great responsibility.

SEN. KERR: The President was there and did it.

SEN. CURTIS: The Democratic Administrations were conducting our foreign affairs when Germany was disunited and divided and it became necessary to carry on the air lift to feed the people of Berlin. The Republican Administration takes steps to restore the German nation as one nation.

REP. HOLIFIELD: I previously made the point that we have turned out, according to the Coordinator of information of the House of Representatives, 58 major legislative accomplishments. We're having some trouble, however, getting them executed in these bureaus of government. For instance, in the Dept. of Immigration and Naturalization, General Swing was put in there and then he wanted two more generals to help him and we had to stop that in Congress by legislation. As a matter of fact, there have been 34 generals and admirals placed in top positions by President Eisenhower and this thing really is the march of the generals into American policy and something, I think, we ought to look at with some apprehension.

REP. KEATING: I'm not here to defend any generals but I certainly would be interested to hear what those 58 major legislative achievements are. As a matter of fact, this Congress has taken no action at all on public aid for schools, a promise to restore rigid price supports for farmers and it hasn't done so, it promised to eradicate discrimination and has done absolutely nothing about it. It promised statehood for Alaska and Hawaii but it failed to produce. It promised to provide more incentive for private business but instead of that it has talked all the time about public ownership in everything. It promised reductions in defense spending but instead has tried by every means to discredit the President's economical defense planning by demanding more money for that purpose. Now, I don't know what these things are he is referring to, but I am referring to a few of the things that they promised the American people but have done absolutely nothing about.

SEN. KERR: It's no surprise that Congressman Keating doesn't know what this Congress has done. He's been here while it took place but there is nothing surprising in the fact that he is not aware of it. The record is available for all of the acts that have passed -- the actions the Democrats have sought. I'd like to pay my respects to the squirrel incident if I may, Mr. Moderator, that Senator Curtis injected into this.

SEN. CURTIS: Oh, no! I didn't inject that into the Senate. That was the Democratic program -- this squirrel thing.

SEN. KERR: Well, the squirrel incident is symbolic of this Republican Administration. It shows the usual procedure wherein the President took a position and then retreated from it. First he said we're going to get rid of them and when the public sent up their voice of protest he said all right, we'll let them stay. First, he was going to continue to reduce air power

SEN. CURTIS: That squirrel thing was part of your program then?

SEN. KERR: Not at all. I'm just saying it's illustrative of this Administration's policy of retreat -- just like you retreated on the question of air power and when the

Democrats showed that the Russians were getting ahead of us and threatening us with supremacy, your Secretary of Defense came up here and said, all right, we had better increase the tempo of building long-range bombers and modernize the jet fighters. On features of the reciprocal trade, after this Congress extended it on the basis that was acceptable to it -- although it was not what the President said he had to have -- he retreated and said this is a great victory -- we'll be glad to take it. Just like Humphrey retreated on whether he was going to repeal the tax loophole on the blooper. Just like you retreated on Dixon-Yates. Just like you retreated on the Big Four Meeting. This Congress has demonstrated that the Democratic leadership has implemented the good things of the President's program and brought forward things which were good for the public and which, by retreat and retreat and retreat, your people in the Congress and your President is accepting and claiming as his own.

SEN. CURTIS: What I can't understand, Senator Kerr, is why you Democrats never make good on your promises. Now you were so loud and vehement in condemning the agricultural situation, and you brought it up in connection with the tax bill about the loss of farm income. You controlled this Congress. You haven't passed any agriculture legislation at all.

SEN. KERR: You want me to answer that right now? We're going to pass the bill before this Congress adjourns. We're in the process of passing it.

SEN. CURTIS: You haven't repealed the Taft-Hartley Law. You haven't repealed this wicked provisions in the tax bill you talked about.

REP. KEATING: Let me add a few more things they haven't done. They haven't done anything about a school bill. They haven't done anything about this Refugee Act amendment. They haven't done anything about health insurance. They haven't done anything about this unnecessary federal competition with private business. All of these things that were right in their campaign documents. It is no surprise to the listeners in this audience that Senator Kerr doesn't know anything about that or that he is completely evasive on all of these matters. That will be no surprise but, nevertheless, it is the fact that the Democrats promised these things and have done absolutely nothing to implement their promises.

REP. HOLIFIELD: Let me answer why we haven't done some of the things. We have, for instance, the housing bill bundled up in the House Rules Committee because we have six Democrats who want to get it out and there are four Republicans and two Democrats who won't get it out of the Rules Committee and all Ike has to do is have one Republican come over and help the six Democrats and we can get that rule to the floor.

MR. BACK: You're talking about public housing now?

REP. HOLIFIELD: Yes, public housing bill. It has other features in it besides public housing. It has the guaranteeing of mortgages and a lot of other parts in it but the point is this, that six out of eight Democrats want to get it out and four Republicans on the committee don't want to get it out and so, with that kind of obstruction, of course, there are certain legislative things that haven't been accomplished.

REP. MEADER: I just want to say, after Mr. Keating read off the list of things that the Democrats had not done, that there is one thing that they did in the House -- this doesn't apply to the Senate -- that I think was very much against the public interest and that is, they excluded radio and television from covering public hearings of House committees. The 80th Congress permitted it -- the 83rd Congress permitted it under a ruling by Speaker Martin, but, not only by a ruling by Speaker Rayburn but by resolution which was considered by the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives, a solemn decision was made to keep the public from using television and radio to witness the public business.

REP. MCCARTHY: On this question of security and covering up news, I think that the Administration has been subjected to more criticism in general on that point of extremes of security and suppression of news than any Democratic Administration. Whether it's just radio or television.....

REP. HOLIFIELD: In fact, we've appointed a committee to investigate that -- a special committee of the House is now going to investigate this very thing, suppression of news by this Administration.

REP. McCARTHY: I'd like to add one note to what Senator Kerr said about really the difficulty of drawing the lines very clearly. As he pointed out -- when Ike doesn't get what he likes, he always likes what he gets -- and with the protection he is given by the press, you're right back where you say, well, he likes it -- this is in a sense what he wanted. At least, that's the indication we're given and the squirrel question, it wasn't just a matter of retreat. The final step was to say Ike had nothing to do with it. He wasn't interested.

REP. MEADER: I might say that I can understand the surprise of my Democratic colleagues on this panel at a President being willing to cooperate with the Congress because they're so used to having Presidents come down here and run Congress as well as the executive branch of the government and, personally, I think it is very refreshing to have a President who has respect for the coordinate branch of the government.

MR. BACK: May I quickly ask each panelist what he considers the major achievement of this Congress.

SEN. KERR: Development of effective united support for the President's foreign policy and the development of effective bipartisan supports for adequate national defense and the responsible position and attitude taken by the Democratic leadership and majorities in the two Houses of this Congress to support the President in those matters where he favored the public welfare and to avoid and protect the public welfare where it did not.

SEN. CURTIS: I think the major achievement will be in a couple of weeks on the resolution to adjourn. It will do the public more good than the continuation of the Democratic Congress.

REP. HOLIFIELD: I think the 58 legislative bills that have been passed and are now law is an adequate record for any Congress and it is an outstanding one in the 13 years that I have been here.

REP. MEADER: I would say that this Congress has not been obstructionist -- I'd say that. What they have done is tried to put a twist on everything the President has proposed to get political advantage out of it. Otherwise, it hasn't been distinguished for its achievements.

MR. BACK: Congressman McCarthy, what one bill that may not pass would you like to see passed. Could you tell me quickly?

REP. McCARTHY: I would like to see the farm bill passed because I believe that the agriculture economy is extremely weak and that it constitutes a threat to the whole economy of the country. It would fulfill one of the very clear promises made by the President back in 1952.

REP. KEATING: I would like to see, more than any other, the health insurance bill passed because there is nothing more important than the health of our people.

MR. BACK: Thank you very much, Senators Kerr and Curtis, and Congressmen McCarthy, Holifield, Meader and Keating, for your interesting discussion.

Our appreciation to the staff of the Senate Radio Gallery and to WMAL, ABC in Washington.

AVAILABLE SOON -- "TOWN MEETING" RECORD ALBUM!

Memorable highlights from 20 years of "Town Meeting" are included in this historic album based on the anniversary broadcast of May 29.....the voices of Wendell Willkie, Adlai Stevenson, Sen. Robert A. Taft, Richard Nixon, Dean Acheson, Fiorello LaGuardia, Arnold Toynbee and many others. Narrated by John Daly.

ASK YOUR DEALER FOR THE "TOWN MEETING" ALBUM BY HERITAGE.